	Case: 1:15-cv-01446-PAG Doc #: 1 Filed: 07/22/15 1 of 15. PageID #	: 1
1		
2	2	
3	3	
4	4	
5	5	
6	6	
7 8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO	
9		
10	110.	
11		
12		
13	and Richard Andrews.	
14 15	Defendants	
16	6	
17	7 COMES NOW Plaintiff, Brandon G. Kirtland ("Plaintiff"), indi	vidually, by and
18	8 through the undersigned attorney and sues the Defendants, RAMB Co., LL	C d/b/a Buffalo
19	9 Wild Wings ("Defendant RAMB") and Richard Andrews (collectively, "D	efendants'"), and
20	0   he alleges as follows:	
21	DDEI IMINIADV CTATEMENIT	
22		
23		neys' fees, costs,
24	and interest under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), as afficilled, 29 (	J.S.C. § 216(b).
25	2. The FLSA was enacted "to protect all covered workers fr	om substandard
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	wages and oppressive working hours "Barrentine v. Ark Best Freight Sys. It	<u>ıc.,</u> 450 U.S. 728,

739 (1981). Under the FLSA, employers must pay all non-exempt employees a minimum
wage of pay for all time spent working during their regular 40 hour workweeks. See 29
U.S.C. § 206(a). The FLSA's definition of the term "wage," in turn, recognizes that under
certain circumstances, an employer of tipped employees may credit a portion of it
employees' tips against its minimum wage obligation, a practice commonly referred to a
taking a "tip credit." See id. § 203(m). The FLSA further recognizes that, under certain
circumstances, an employee may be engaged in "dual jobs," during which an employer may
only impose a tip credit on an employee's wages for time spent working while engaged in a
tip-producing occupation. See 29 U.S.C. § 203(m). See also 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(e)
Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook § 30d00(e).

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. This civil action arises under the Constitution and law of the United States.
- 4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(ii) because acts giving rise to the claims of Plaintiff occurred within the Northern District of Ohio, and Defendants regularly conduct business in and have engaged in the wrongful conduct alleged herein and, thus, are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

#### **PARTIES**

5. At all material times, Plaintiff is an individual residing in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, and is a former employee of Defendants.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

6.	At all material times, Defendant RAMB was a limited liability company du
licensed to tr	ransact business in the State of Ohio. Defendant RAMB does business, h
offices, and/o	or maintains agents for the transaction of its customary business in Cuyahog
County, Ohio	).

- 7. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant RAMB. At all relevant times, Defendant RAMB, acting through its agents, representatives, employees, managers, members, and/or other representatives had the authority to hire and fire employees, supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment, determined the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in connection with Plaintiff's employment with Defendant RAMB. In any event, at all relevant times, Defendant RAMB was an employer subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and employed Plaintiff.
- 8. At all relevant times, Defendant Richard Andrews owns, operates as a manager of, operates as a member of, and/or possesses a similar interest in Defendant RAMB. At all relevant times, Defendant Richard Andrews had the authority to hire and fire employees, supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment, determined the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in connection with Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant RAMB. In any event, at all relevant times, Defendant Richard Andrews was an employer subject to the FLSA and employed Plaintiff.
- 9. Upon information and belief, Defendant Richard Andrews was and continues to be a resident of Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

#### Case: 1:15-cv-01446-PAG Doc #: 1 Filed: 07/22/15 4 of 15. PageID #: 4

- 10. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an "employee" of RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews as defined by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.
- 11. The provisions set forth in the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., apply to RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews.
- 12. At all relevant times, RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews were and continue to be "employers" as defined by FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.
- 13. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and exercised control over Plaintiff's work and wages at all relevant times.
- 14. Plaintiff, in his work for Defendants, was employed by an enterprise engaged in commerce that had annual gross sales of at least \$500,000.

#### NATURE OF THE CLAIM

- 15. Defendants own and/or operates as RAMB Co., LLC d/b/a Buffalo Wild Wings, an enterprise located in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.
- 16. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants as a tipped employee as defined by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., to work as a server, and Plaintiff worked for Defendants between approximately March 1, 2014 and December 31, 2014, when Plaintiff left his employment with Defendants.
- 17. Rather than pay their tipped employees the applicable minimum wage, for the time Plaintiff was paid as a tipped employee, Defendants imposed a tip credit upon Plaintiff at below the applicable minimum wage.
- 18. As a result of Defendant's imposition of a tip credit, Plaintiff was forced to perform work at an hourly rate that was less than the applicable minimum wage.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

19. Defend	dants engaged in the regular practice of requiring Plaintiff to perform
substantial amount o	f non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of 20% o
his regular workwee	k and non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over th
course of his regular	workweeks.

- 20. Examples of non-tipped labor related to Plaintiff's tipped occupation that exceeded 20% of Plaintiff's regular workweek, include, but are not limited to: preparatory and workplace maintenance tasks such as brewing tea, brewing coffee, rolling silverware, cleaning soft drink dispensers, wiping down tables, setting tables, busing tables, cutting and stocking fruit, stocking ice, taking out trash, scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, restocking togo supplies, cleaning booths, cleaning ramekins, sweeping, mopping, restocking all stations, washing dishes, and breaking down and cleaning the expo line.
- 21. Examples of non-tipped labor unrelated to Plaintiff's tipped occupation that Plaintiff performed during his regular workweeks, include, but are not limited to: preparatory and workplace maintenance tasks such as taking out trash, scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, cleaning booths, sweeping, mopping, washing dishes, breaking down and cleaning the expo line, restocking restrooms, and cleaning toilets, urinals, and restroom floors.
- 22. As a result of Defendants' willful requirement that Plaintiff perform a substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of 20% of his regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of his regular workweeks, Defendants paid Plaintiff less than the overall minimum wage for such work that Plaintiff performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiff's hourly wages was less than the applicable minimum wage.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

23. In both policy and practice, Defendants regularly and consistently required Plaintiff to perform the above-listed non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of twenty percent (20%) of Plaintiff's regular workweek before, during, and after scheduled shifts; before the restaurant was open to customers; after the restaurant was closed to customers; while Plaintiff had few to no customers to serve; before serving his first customer; and after being "cut" from serving customers.

- 24. In both policy and practice, Defendants regularly and consistently required Plaintiff to perform the above-listed non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation during the course of Plaintiff's regular workweek before, during, and after scheduled shifts; before the restaurant was open to customers; after the restaurant was closed to customers; while Plaintiff had few to no customers to serve; before serving his first customer; and after being "cut" from serving customers.
- 25. As a result of Defendants' requirement that Plaintiff perform such non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation, and in excess of twenty percent (20%) of his regular workweek, while earning the reduced tip credit rate, Plaintiff was engaged in a non-tipped occupation, as defined by the "dual jobs" regulation 29 C.F.R. §§ 531.56(e) and (a) and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook §30d00(e), for such work performed during that time. Such work performed by Plaintiff included, but was not limited to, spending more than part of his time cleaning and setting tables and making coffee, and more than occasionally washing dishes or glasses. As a result, Defendants were prohibited from taking the tip credit for the hours Plaintiff spent working in a non-tipped occupation. Plaintiff is, therefore, entitled, under 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(a) and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), to the

overall minimum wage for all time spent performing such non-tipped, dual occupation labor. As such, Defendants paid Plaintiff less than the overall minimum wage for the work Plaintiff performed during his regular workweek, in willful violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

- 26. As a result of Defendants' requirement that Plaintiff perform such non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation, while earning the reduced tip credit rate, Plaintiff was engaged in a non-tipped occupation, as defined by the "dual jobs" regulation 29 C.F.R. §§ 531.56(e) and (a) and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook §30d00(e), for such work performed during that time. Such work performed by Plaintiff included, but was not limited to, spending more than part of his time cleaning and setting tables and making coffee, and more than occasionally washing dishes or glasses. As a result, Defendants were prohibited from taking the tip credit for the hours Plaintiff spent working in their non-tipped occupation. Plaintiff is, therefore, entitled, under 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(a), to the overall minimum wage for all time spent performing such non-tipped, dual occupation labor. As such, Defendants paid Plaintiff less than the overall minimum wage for the work Plaintiff performed during his regular workweek, in willful violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).
- 27. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff the applicable minimum wage for such hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).
- 28. Defendants knew that or acted with reckless disregard as to whether their failure to pay to Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage, without applying the tip credit, for time spent performing labor in such a non-tipped occupation, would violate federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA.

- 29. Defendants have and continue to willfully violate the FLSA by not paying Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage for time spent performing non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of 20% of his regular workweeks, and non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of his regular workweeks.
- 30. In a given workweek, and during each and every workweek for which Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a tipped employee, Defendants required Plaintiff to perform a substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of 20% of his regular workweek and non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of his regular workweek. Defendants paid Plaintiff less than the overall minimum wage for such work that Plaintiff performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiff's hourly wages was less than the applicable minimum wage, in willful violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a). Defendants required Plaintiff to perform non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of 20% of his regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation each and every workweek during which he worked for Defendants.
- 31. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants owe him similar wages for each and every workweek during which he worked for Defendants for the entire duration of his employment. Furthermore, when an employer fails to keep complete and accurate time records, employees may establish the hours worked by their testimony, and the burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

32. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of failing to accurately, if at a
record the time during which Defendants suffered or permitted Plaintiff to work. As such
Defendant's records of Plaintiff's time worked, if in existence, understate the duration of
time each workweek that Defendants suffered or permitted Plaintiff to work.

- 33. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(m), and Ohio wage and hour law, employers may impose a tip credit on their tipped employees' wages of up 50% of the minimum wage, on the condition that, among other requirements, such employees have been informed by the employer of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m).
- 34. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiff of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m) at any time over the duration of their employment with Defendants. As such, Defendants were not entitled to impose any tip credit upon Plaintiff's wages, and Defendants should have therefore paid the full Ohio minimum wage to Plaintiffs for all time Plaintiffs worked during the course of their regular 40-hour workweeks.
- As such, full minimum wage for such time is owed to Plaintiff for the entire 35. time he was employed by Defendants.
- Plaintiff is a covered employee within the meaning of the Fair Labor 36. Standards Act ("FLSA").
  - 37. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee.
- 38. Defendants refused and/or failed to properly disclose to or apprise Plaintiff of his rights under the FLSA.
- 39. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and exercised control over Plaintiff's work and wages at all relevant times.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

40	).	Due to Defer	ndan	ts' illegal	wage p	racti	ces, Plaintif	f is entitle	ed to r	ecover fro	on
Defendan	ıts	compensation	for	unpaid	wages,	an	additional	amount	equal	amount	a
liquidated	ł da	ımages, interest	, and	reasona	ble atto	ney'	's fees and	costs of the	his acti	on under	29
U.S.C. § 2	216	(b).									

41. Plaintiff has retained The Bendau Law Firm, PLLC to represent him in this litigation and has agreed to pay a reasonable fee for the services rendered in the prosecution of this action on his behalf.

## **COUNT ONE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT** NON-TIPPED LABOR RELATED TO TIPPED WORK IN EXCESS OF 20%

- 42. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 43. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to comply with the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(e), and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook §30d00(e) by requiring Plaintiff in a given workweek, and during each and every workweek Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, to perform non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of twenty percent (20%) of his regular 40-hour workweek, while paying Plaintiff at the tip credit rate.
- 44. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage according to the provisions of the FLSA for time he spent performing non-tipped labor related to his tipped occupation in excess of twenty percent (20%) of a given workweek, for each and every workweek that Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	45.	-	As suc	h, fı	ıll applica	ble r	ninimı	ım w	age for	such time l	Plain	itiff p	erformed n	on
tipped	labo	r re	elated to	o hi	s tipped o	ccup	oation	in exc	cess of	twenty perc	ent	(20%)	) of his reg	ula
workv	veek	is	owed	to	Plaintiff	for	each	and	every	workweek	he	was	employed	b
Defen	dants	:												

- 46. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their failure to pay to Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage, without applying the tip credit, for time spent performing labor in such a non-tipped occupation, would violate federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA.
- 47. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for the full minimum wage at an hourly rate, to be proven at trial, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, together with interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Brandon G. Kirtland, individually, respectfully requests that this Court grant relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews for compensation for unpaid minimum wages, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorney fees, costs, and disbursements of this action, and any additional relief this Court deems just and proper.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

## COUNT TWO: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT NON-TIPPED LABOR UNRELATED TO TIPPED WORK

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding 48. paragraphs.
- 49. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to comply with the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(e), and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook §30d00(e) by requiring Plaintiff in a given workweek, and during each and every workweek Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, to perform non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of his regular 40-hour workweek, while paying Plaintiff at the tip credit rate.
- 50. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage according to the provisions of the FLSA for time he spent performing non-tipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of a given workweek, for each and every workweek that Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).
- 51. As such, full applicable minimum wage for such time Plaintiff performed nontipped labor unrelated to his tipped occupation over the course of his regular workweek is owed to Plaintiff for each and every workweek he was employed by Defendants.
- 52. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their failure to pay to Plaintiff the full applicable minimum wage, without applying the tip credit, for time spent performing labor in such a non-tipped occupation, would violate federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Plaintiff's	employment.	As such,	Defendants'	conduct	constitutes	a willful	violation	of tl
FLSA.								

53. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for the full minimum wage at an hourly rate, to be proven at trial, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, together with interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Brandon G. Kirtland, individually, respectfully requests that this Court grant relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews for compensation for unpaid minimum wages, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorney fees, costs, and disbursements of this action, and any additional relief this Court deems just and proper.

## COUNT THREE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE OF TIP CREDIT TO PLAINTIFF

- 54. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 55. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to inform Plaintiff of the provisions of the "tip credit" and 29 U.S.C. § 203(m) and its supporting regulations.
- 56. Defendants intentionally failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff the full minimum wage according to the provisions of the FLSA for each and every workweek that Plaintiff worked for Defendants, for the duration of his employment, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).
- 57. As such, full applicable minimum wage for such time Plaintiff worked is owed to Plaintiff for the entire time he was employed by Defendants.

	58.	Defendants knew that - or acted with reckless disregard as to whether - their
failure	to pay t	to Plaintiff the full minimum wage over the course of their employment would
violate	federal	and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage
require	ements	during Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a
willful	violatio	n of the FLSA.

59. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for the full minimum wage at an hourly rate, to be proven at trial, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, together with interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Brandon G. Kirtland, individually, respectfully requests that this Court grant relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants RAMB Co., LLC and Richard Andrews for compensation for unpaid minimum wages, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorney fees, costs, and disbursements of this action, and any additional relief this Court deems just and proper.

# JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

	Case: 1:15-cv-01446-PAG Doc #: 1 Filed: 07/22/15 15 of 15. PageID #: 15
1	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22 <sup>nd</sup> Day of July 2015.
2	THE BENDAU LAW FIRM, PLLC
3	By: /s/ Clifford P. Bendau, II
4	Clifford P. Bendau, II (OH No. 0089601) THE BENDAU LAW FIRM PLLC
5	6350 East Thomas Road, Suite 330 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
6	Telephone AZ: (480) 296-7887 Telephone OH: (216) 395-4226
7	Telephone AZ: (480) 296-7887 Telephone OH: (216) 395-4226 Facsimile: (480) 429-3679 Email: cliffordbendau@bendaulaw.com
8	
9	THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW J. SIMON
10	By: <u>/s/ James L. Simon</u> James L. Simon (OH No. 89483) THE LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW J.
11	SIMON
12	6000 Freedom Square Dr. Independence, OH 44131
13	Independence, OH 44131 Telephone: (216) 525-8890 Facsimile: (216) 642-5814 Email: jameslsimonlaw@yahoo.com
14	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	_15_